

totally unacceptable for us to be talking about taking that working families' tax cut away to give more subsidies to people who are not paying income taxes.

To me, that is what this whole issue is about. It never ceases to amaze me when we look at these polls to see that people believe that the President is right, and that, in fact, we are talking about redistributing wealth to the wealthy.

The Tax Code in America is more progressive today than it was the day Ronald Reagan was elected President. Higher income Americans are paying a larger percentage of the tax—bearing more of the burden of taxes today than they were the day Ronald Reagan became President. Lower income Americans are bearing a lower share of the tax burden.

For those who want to complain about payroll taxes, let us remember who made a proposal 3 years ago to almost double payroll taxes to pay for national health insurance. It sure was not me. I am happy to count myself among the number who killed that proposal. That proposal was made by the same President who today laments the burden of payroll taxes when in fact 3 years ago he wanted to almost double it.

I do not like engaging in these kinds of debates, I do not think they are very productive. We should be talking about creating wealth rather than redistributing it. But since some of our colleagues spent an hour this morning talking about redistributing wealth, I felt obliged to come out and join others in trying to set the record straight.

I yield the floor.

Mr. KERREY addressed the Chair.

The PRESIDING OFFICER. The Senator from Nebraska.

CONGRATULATIONS TO THE FCC

Mr. KERREY. Mr. President, during the last several weeks, I have taken the floor to discuss my concerns about the approach the Department of Justice has taken on mergers among and between large telecommunications companies.

I was particularly disappointed with the decision of the Department of Justice to approve the Bell Atlantic/NYNEX merger without any conditions.

Today, I take the floor to congratulate the Federal Communications Commission for doing what the Department of Justice was unwilling to do. This weekend the FCC announced that it had concluded an 11-page letter of agreement with Bell Atlantic and NYNEX on pro-competitive conditions for its merger.

While I continue to question the underlying competitive merit of the Bell Atlantic/NYNEX combination, the efforts of the FCC certainly mitigate the decision of the Department of Justice to approve the merger. It is only unfortunate that the Department of Justice

had not demonstrated the same commitment to competition.

The FCC negotiated a 4 year pro-competitive agreement with Bell Atlantic and NYNEX which includes the use of forward looking costs for competitive interconnection agreements, the use of uniform interfaces for interconnection, greater reporting requirements, access for competitors to efficient operating support systems, and performance guarantees. These commitments hold the promise of giving competition a chance to take root.

The use of forward looking costs within the 13 States which make up the Bell Atlantic/NYNEX region is especially significant in light of the Friday decision of the Eighth Circuit Court of Appeals to bar the FCC from setting interconnection prices. A nation grew from 13 colonies, perhaps a telecommunications revolution can grow from 13 States.

I applaud the FCC and Chairman Hundt for showing independence and a commitment to competition. The course of action chosen by the Commission highlights the importance of the FCC's political independence. As an independent regulatory body, the Commission was able to use its authority to protect the public interest to win pro-competitive concessions from Bell Atlantic and NYNEX, notwithstanding the failure of the Department of Justice to do so.

I urge my colleagues to give this case careful study as the Congress considers telecommunications policy. In the coming weeks and months, the Congress will consider confirming four new members of the Federal Communications Commission. At stake is whether the Congressional vision of competition and universal service which brings more choice, more investment, more jobs, and lower prices to the telecommunications market is fulfilled or not.

The success or failure of the Telecommunications Act of 1996 depends almost entirely on a new team of regulators at the Department of Justice and the FCC.

To succeed, they must have an unrelenting commitment to competition and universal service. Without that commitment, the act is doomed to failure. The result will be higher prices, greater consolidation and fewer choices.

Mr. President, I applaud the FCC for its action in this case. The Congress must assure that the new members of the FCC have the same courage to exercise their independence, as this Commission has done to protect the public interest.

Thank you, Mr. President.

Mr. GRAMS addressed the Chair.

The PRESIDING OFFICER. The Senator from Minnesota.

Mr. GRAMS. Thank you very much, Mr. President.

TAX CUTS

Mr. GRAMS. Mr. President, I come to the floor this morning after hearing

some of my colleagues earlier talking and debating about the proposed tax cuts that is now in conference. The question is always: Who qualifies for the tax cut? How much is that tax cut going to be? Who is going to receive what share of that tax cut?

I would like to start out by saying that it is kind of ironic to hear some on the floor arguing about these tax cut packages because these are the same individuals who, along with President Clinton, just 4 years ago were on this floor arguing for the largest tax increase on Americans in history.

When we look at this major tax increase of just 4 years ago, I would like to relate to the comments made by the minority leader, the Senator from South Dakota, earlier this week when he argued that the \$77 billion tax cut was not fair. That is what we have heard here this morning on the floor—it is not fair. While I don't believe it was fair in 1993 to raise the largest tax increase in history on Americans, they say, "Well, it was only aimed at the rich." But let me tell you.

Let me remind my colleagues what happened in 1993. After campaigning on middle-class tax relief in 1993, President Clinton turned around and then raised taxes by \$263 billion, again making that the largest tax increase in history. But he said it was only for the rich. But everybody paid more, including \$114 billion in new income taxes, \$24 billion in new gasoline taxes, \$35 billion in new business taxes, and \$30 billion in new payroll taxes. Then you add on top of that nearly \$25 billion more in Social Security taxes. In other words, if you work, if you are retired, if you drove a car, if you owned a business, or if you paid any kind of income tax, you paid for the 1993 income tax increase.

I heard also this morning that what we are talking about today in this tax package is that about \$77 billion so far of net tax relief is "substantial" tax relief. Well, when you get back only \$1 on every \$4 that was raised in 1993, I don't call this "substantial." This is a meager tax package that we are talking about. The reason that it is not fair, in my opinion, is because there is not enough in this tax package to go around.

It does not take a mathematician also to calculate that if taxes raised were \$263 billion 4 years ago and you get \$77 billion back now, that is not a good deal. If you look at since the tax reduction that everybody blames for the deficits, and that is the Ronald Reagan tax cut in 1981, they say since that tax cut it has resulted in all these deficits: We have these deficits today because of the Ronald Reagan tax cut. In fact, we have had 10 tax increases since 1981—10, over \$850 billion in new tax increases since 1981. And now we are talking about \$77 billion. This is less than \$1 on every \$10 of tax increases over the last 10 years.

We also hear about, well, who is going to be getting these tax breaks?